

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JASSEN LEE CLAWSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

A147162

(Mendocino County  
Super. Ct. No. SCTM CRCR 15-83304)

Defendant Jassen Lee Clawson appeals the judgment following his guilty plea. Appointed appellate counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), in which he raises no issue for appeal and asks this court of independent review of the record. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 124 (*Kelly*)) Counsel attests that defendant was advised of his right to file a supplemental brief in a timely manner, but defendant has not exercised such right.

We have examined the entire record in accordance with *Wende*. For reasons set forth below, we agree with counsel that no arguable issue exists on appeal. Accordingly, we affirm.

**FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

Defendant was charged by felony complaint with transportation of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11379, subd. (a)) and possession for sale of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378).

Before any preliminary hearing was held, defendant withdrew his not guilty pleas and pleaded guilty to one count of transporting methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code,

§ 11379, subd. (a)). Defendant signed and initialed the plea form waiving his rights, inter alia, to a preliminary hearing, to trial by jury, to confront and examine witnesses, to subpoena witnesses for the defense, to testify on his own behalf, and his privilege against self-incrimination. The factual basis<sup>1</sup> for the plea was that following a traffic stop for displaying fraudulent license plates, defendant, an unlicensed driver on summary probation, was arrested. A search of the vehicle revealed 3.4 grams of methamphetamine in the center console. Based on the arresting officer's experience, the quantity of methamphetamine exceeded the amount typically possessed by an average user. In his statement to the police following his arrest, defendant offered contradictory explanations for the presence of the methamphetamine in his vehicle. Initially, he denied he had any knowledge about the presence of the methamphetamine in the center console. Eventually, defendant admitted that he had purchased the methamphetamine, but claimed he did not know where his supplier had put it in the vehicle. Defendant explained that he did not do "hand to product contact" when obtaining methamphetamine.

In accordance with the plea agreement, the trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed defendant on probation for 36 months conditioned upon, among other things, that he serve 180 days in the county jail.

Defendant obtained a certificate of probable cause and this timely appeal followed.

### **DISCUSSION**

We have conducted an independent review of the record and we find no arguable issues relating to the plea bargain, the imposition of sentence, or any other matter occurring after entry of defendant's plea. The record reflects defendant was painstakingly advised of his rights both orally at the plea hearing and in the plea form. Defendant stated that he understood the consequences of his plea. Defendant was represented at all relevant times by counsel and he freely and knowingly entered the plea. Defendant's sentence was lawful.

---

<sup>1</sup> The facts are taken from a synopsis of the police report contained in the probation officer's report and recommendation.

Thus, having ensured defendant has received adequate and effective appellate review, we affirm the trial court's judgment. (*Kelly, supra*, 40 Cal.4th at pp. 112-113; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.)

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

---

Reardon, Acting P.J.

We concur:

---

Rivera, J.

---

Streeter, J.